REMARKS

Applicants request reconsideration of this application in view of the prior Amendment.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Earlier objections to the abstract, drawings, and claims 1, 7, 10 and 14 have been withdrawn by the Examiner. The Examiner has further withdrawn the rejection of Claim 11 stands under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,850,517 issued to Verkler *et al.* (hereinafter "Verkler"); claims 8-13, 15, 16, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable for obviousness over U.S. Patent No. 6,665,711 to Boyle *et al.* (hereinafter "Boyle") in view of Verkler. Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable for obviousness over Boyle in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,643,650 to Slaughter *et al.* (hereinafter "Slaughter"); and claims 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable for obviousness over Boyle in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,700,902 to Meyer (hereinafter "Meyer").

Claims 1-20 remain pending.

Independent claims 1 and 8 have been earlier amended to include the feature of the present invention that permits priority treatment *of a specific connection between a wireless mobile device and a remote computer network* through the mimicking of circuit-like connections from simple two-way messaging devices to computer networks in order to facilitate secure and stable browsing sessions. None of the cited prior art, alone or in combination, claims, discloses or teaches such a feature.

The Examiner cites Verkler's use of an agent to "fool" a server and its associated network into thinking that it is talking to a client as anticipatory of the mimicking of circuit-like connections of the present invention. However, Verkler's ability to "fool" a server is not

analogous, since Verkler describes a situation only where the "client 101 is communicating over a wireless connection [with the agent, not with the remote computer network] *or is not connected at all* when information is passed to agent 102.[1] To the extent that the "fooling" of Verkler could possibly be analogous to the mimicking of circuit-like connections of the present invention, Verkler's "fooling" feature clearly does not apply to *a specific connection between a wireless mobile device and a remote computer network.* In other words, Verkler is attempting to fool the server into believing that there is a specific connection when there in fact is *no specific connection* between a client and the remote computer network.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that in light of an understanding of the inapplicability of Verkler to the claims of the present invention, the application is in condition for allowance, and request reconsideration of the application on that basis. An early favorable response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Russell O. Paige (Reg. No. 40,758)

Jones Day
51 Louisiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20001
Tel. (202) 879-3939

Date: June 1, 2005

---

[1] Verkler, col. 4, lines 7-11 (emphasis added).